

Contradictions in the Bioeconomy and the importance of Biocultural Protocols





The bioeconomy actively promotes the increased consumption and production of biomass based products, including in particular wood



REDD+ = Performance-based payments: a country or actors within that country receives a payment for storing or sequestering a certain amount of carbon through forest-related activities (conservation, improved logging, plantation establishment, restoration);

Who will pay? Unclear, as developed countries say most of the funding will come from “private investors” = carbon offsets. But carbon markets are in crisis due to the lack of willingness to take up legally binding commitments. 98% of the regulated carbon market excludes REDD+ until at least 2020;

Voluntary forest carbon offset market is unreliable, volatile, inequitable, corporate-driven, and unethical.



Increasing recognition amongst REDD+ policy makers that drivers of deforestation and forest degradation should be addressed;

But forestry sector opposes clear definition of forest degradation and policies to reduce wood consumption;

The drivers of forest loss and forest land grabbing will not be addressed by PES-like schemes, as leakage will be unavoidable without addressing demand-side drivers.

Commodity Roundtables (RSPO, RSB, RTRS) are industry-driven and unable to address quantity-related aspects and indirect land use change.



The National Federation of Farmers in Paraguay, the national association of NGO networks, and many other movements and NGOs reject the
“Roundtable on Responsible Soy”
because of the conceptual aberrations of the process





Other Risks of REDD+:

- Powerful elites will capture the benefits by grabbing forest land and closing false and unfair deals with forest peoples;
- Focus on carbon promotes monoculture tree plantations and ignores social and cultural values;
- Counting how much carbon is stored is expensive – most funds will go to administrators;
- REDD+ is a neo-liberal, market-driven approach that leads to commodification of life and undermining community values;
- REDD+ will undermine the climate regime by allowing polluters to continue;

Main post-Durban REDD+ Risk:

Biocultural Value Systems by Indigenous Peoples and local communities that conserved forests for non-commercial reasons have been undermined by expectations of payments for environmental services;

Unfilled promises about full compensation for opportunity costs of reducing forest loss will incentivize countries and actors within countries to revert to forest destruction;

Countries will indebt themselves for national PES systems, which will turn out to be financial unsustainable

How can we save forests and forest communities from a broken REDD dream?





Biocultural protocols can form a joint framework that strengthens the resilience of Indigenous peoples against top-down policies and project proposals that are imposed on them by outside actors, including with false promises.

It allows people to reflect and build a joint vision on a community's own territory, traditional resource rights, livelihood aspirations, and governance structures.

It can help them formulate in advance what their position will be if they are approached by outside actors with REDD+ proposals, and how they want to be consulted on such proposals.

Through the development of a Biocultural Protocol, indigenous peoples and communities can make more effective use of their right to Free Prior and Informed Consent.



Thank you!